



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE SUNDAY WORSHIP OF THE PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANS

PROFESSOR J. VERNON BARTLET
Oxford, England

In the consideration of this whole subject the fundamental fact is that Christianity was born within the sphere of Judaism, and particularly the Judaism of the synagogue. Thus until in any given case we have seen good reason to exclude the general probability of continuity between the usages of the synagogue and the church, we must see how far we can go on this principle of interpretation as applied to the origins of Christian worship. Influences from outside Judaism no doubt had a growing effect upon Christian thought and practice in this respect as in other directions; but such influences were secondary in time and more unconscious in operation than those of Judaism itself, the parent of the new religion, in whose ways the earliest believers in Jesus, whether Jews or gentile adherents of the synagogue, had been trained to walk in worshipping the true God. We must, indeed, be vigilant to note how the new and transfiguring spirit of the higher and larger faith showed its presence from the first even under the old forms. Yet we must be careful to do justice to the outward continuity, since the gospel was essentially new in the spirit rather than in the letter, as one may see in the Sermon on the Mount, and even in separate clauses of the Lord's Prayer.

The chief day of Christian worship itself illustrates the principles just laid down. It was only gradually that the Lord's Day replaced the Jewish sabbath, though from the very first it existed side by side with it. The most marked instance of the survival of the sabbath among Christians was naturally afforded by the conservative types of Judaism within the Holy Land, where all that was characteristic of Israel's religion was clung to most tenaciously, even after the destruction of the Temple in 70 A. D. had brought home to many Jewish Christians outside Palestine that the national elements in Mosaism had really been abrogated, their abiding spiritual essence having been taken up into the religion of Messiah. The conserva-

tism in question existed in two degrees, according as the observance of the sabbath and other Mosaic institutions was regarded as essential to union with Jesus the Messiah, or only as desirable, especially for born Jews. The former position was a bar to communion with gentile Christianity, and its upholders became by their own choice a sect outside the church as a whole. The latter admitted of intercommunion; and this was practiced on both sides to some degree down to the middle of the second century,¹ and even later.

The more liberal type of Ebionites or Nazareans observed, as has been hinted, both the sabbath and the Lord's Day—in memory of the Savior's resurrection. Accordingly we may suppose that this represented the practice of the apostolic community in Jerusalem under the leadership of James the Lord's brother (down to about 62 A. D.), viz., that its members "rested" on "the sabbath of the Lord" like other Jews, but also celebrated the first day of the week as "the Lord's Day" in a special sense. Such "resting" in Jewish legal fashion, however, was generally recognized in the church at large as incumbent only on Jewish believers, and probably was practiced even by some of these, men of emancipated spirit like Paul and Barnabas, only in so far as circumstances allowed. There is no evidence that the Jewish sabbath was imposed, even alongside the Christian Lord's Day, upon gentile Christians outside Palestine. Yet where Jewish Christians were numerous and tradition in favor of sabbath observance by proselytes was strong, as, e. g., in Antioch and Syria generally, many gentiles may voluntarily have conformed in this matter, in deference to the scruples of their Jewish brethren, if not for other and less enlightened motives. This is likely *à priori*, and it best fits certain phenomena of the apostolic and sub-apostolic ages. Thus Paul has to correct an undue tendency on the part of Christians at Colossæ, as earlier in South Galatia, to observe scrupulously or in a legal spirit the sabbath, as well as other Jewish feast-days (New Moons, etc.), forgetting that they were but "a shadow of things to come."² So was it also at Rome. Later on, too, Ignatius strives earnestly against a widespread tendency in the Roman province of Asia, as perhaps also in his own Syrian Antioch, to live in

¹ See Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*, chap. 47.

² Col. 2:16 f.

Judaic fashion; and he refers to "sabbatizing" as one form of it.³ To this he opposes "living after the Lord's Day, wherein also our life rose again (like the Sun) through Him and his death." That is, he urges that the Lord's Day expresses the principle of the new dispensation, while the Jewish sabbath is part and parcel of a lower dispensation altogether. They are on different planes to his eye, and so he calls on Christians to break with the lower and adhere only to the higher—as if there were a long-established custom in the regions in question to serve God under both forms, and so with both sets of associations. Such a moment of decision and separation was bound to come sooner or later. The old usage was an ambiguous one and lent a handle to Judaizing on principle. It had been natural in the early days when everything was felt to be provisional, as "in the last days," before Messiah's return should usher in the perfect spiritual order. But if it was sapping consistent Christian principle, it could no longer be tolerated; it had had its day, and must cease to be for the health of the Christian consciousness.

Such was Ignatius' feeling, and it was shared by Christians in general. Indeed, elsewhere the dual state of things had for the most part come to an end, even where it had existed. A generation earlier, perhaps, a teacher in the Alexandrine church had written against the Judaic observance of the sabbath, in warning certain Egyptian Christians against "shipwreck" of their Christian faith upon the Jewish law.⁴ To him, not the seventh, but the eighth day is the Christian's festival, the foretaste of the new world-order of which the Lord was to make a beginning even in the seventh millennium of the world's history, the true sabbath-rest of all things. "Wherefore also," says he, "we keep the eighth day as a day of gladness, in the which also Jesus rose from the dead and after manifestation ascended into the heavens," as first-fruits of the heavenly heritage of humanity. Akin to this mode of thought is the pleonastic phrase "the Lord's day of the Lord" (*κυριακὴ Κυρίου*), used in the *Didachē* (chap. xiv)—a work probably also of Alexandrine origin, a decade or two later—in contrast to the "sabbath of the Lord" proper to Judaism.

So far, however, nothing has been said inconsistent with a certain

³ *Ad Magn.*, VIII, IX.

⁴ *Barn.*, chap. xv; cf. chap. iii *fn.*

religious observance of the sabbath by Christians generally as a day of hallowed associations of thankful worship in the minds of former proselytes, as well as of born Jews. It is simply the legalism of a "rest" consisting of enforced abstinence from "work," as defined by Jewish usage on the basis of the Mosaic law, that has been in question.⁵ The great majority of primitive Christians even outside Palestine—where, as we have seen, the old order lasted side by side with the new—had some Jewish antecedents; and clearly the Lord's Day even in Pauline churches, where we first trace its observance, was a weekly festival suggested by the sabbath which it immediately followed. It may well be, then, that both days were specially set apart to religious purposes, though not quite in the old way. Such we find to have been the case generally in later times, especially throughout the East, though from the third century the West tended to make Saturday a fast-day instead of a feast-day. Indeed, Socrates, the church historian, tells us⁶ that everywhere save in Alexandria and Rome ("by a certain ancient tradition") a weekly celebration of the eucharist was held on sabbath, as well as on Sunday; while even at Alexandria they had public service on that day, as Athanasius⁷ witnesses for his time.

The close conjunction of these two days as a continuous season of special worship was possibly facilitated by the Jewish or oriental mode of reckoning the day from evening to evening, so that the Lord's Day would begin on the evening of Saturday, according to Roman or western reckoning. It is likely, then, that in Jewish-Christian circles generally, the weekly Lord's Supper was at first held on the Saturday evening, at the end of the sabbath and the beginning of "the first day of the week," the Lord's Day. This would explain the custom in Egypt, except Alexandria, even in the fifth century,⁸ of keeping Saturday with feasting (like the Jewish sabbath) and then "about evening" observing the eucharist. But where Græco-Roman usage was prevalent, as in the province of Asia,⁹ we find "the first day of the week" already reckoned as we

⁵ Cf. the Synod of Laodicea in Phrygia (about 360 A. D.), Canon 16, compared with Canon 29.

⁶ V, 22.

⁸ Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.*, V, 22.

⁷ Homily *De Semente, ad init.*

⁹ Cf. 1 Cor. 16:2 for Corinth.

reckon Sunday, and the Lord's Supper held during its evening. The same was the case in Bithynia about 112 A. D., as we shall see later in connection with Pliny's account of Christian practices.

On the whole, then, we find that, though there was some difference at certain periods and in certain regions, according as Jewish associations were strong or weak, as to the degree in which the sabbath was honored along with the distinctively Christian festal day, "the Lord's Day," yet gentile Christianity from the first set aside the Jewish legal way of keeping sabbath by resting from work; and further, the day of special Christian sanctity and worship was always and in all circles, other than the narrowest of the Ebionites in Palestine, the Lord's Day,¹⁰ whenever it might be reckoned locally to begin.

In passing to the manner of early Christian worship on the Lord's Day or Sunday, we have to bear in mind from the first the highly spiritual genius of the gospel of Christ lying at the heart of primitive church life. "It has no sacred days or seasons, no special sanctuaries, because every time and every place alike are holy. Above all it has no sacerdotal system." So wrote Bishop Lightfoot in his memorable essay on *The Christian Ministry*. Nor shall we ever realize the primitive situation till we do justice to the fact that no system of worship was prescribed by the church's Founder, and that only one distinctive rite, or rather custom, was intrusted by him to his followers to observe, namely, "the breaking of bread" in remembrance of himself at the moment when he was about to yield up his life to secure to them the privileges of access to and fellowship in a perfected form of the divine covenant with Israel. But he did more and better than prescribe a system: he bequeathed a spirit, akin to his own, which could freely adopt and adapt what was congruous with itself in the

¹⁰ The question as to the coming in of the term "Sunday" as the civil synonym of the Christian name for "the first day of the week," the Lord's Day, is of little or no moment. It was gradually adopted by the Christians as they had occasion to address pagan non-believers (so the *Apologies* of Justin and Tertullian), first in a way which indicated that they were borrowing their form, "Day of the Sun (God)," in order to be understood, and then gradually in common social intercourse. But it was only after the alliance of the church with the state in Constantine's person, and partly in consequence of the imperial use of the term (as one familiar even to pagan subjects) in legislation on the subject of the observance of this day of the week, that it began to be used at all freely by Christians.

old familiar forms of Jewish piety, assumed by him as to their hand to use, and, where needful, fashion "fresh wineskins" for itself. Spirituality shows itself neither in overvaluing nor in undervaluing religious forms, but in seeing and treating all forms as "letter" in relation to "spirit," and so being free to use or not use any given form in the interest of the supreme spiritual ends, including the paramount ideal of brotherly love and concord. Such was the temper of primitive Christianity, with the freedom of the Spirit as impulse, and mutual edification as the law of a common worship that was the supreme form of the fellowship (*κοινωνία*), or joint life, which was the all-embracing expression of a brotherhood resting on divine sonship. Thus, though, as living in time and space, primitive Christians came to worship at certain seasons and in given places—differing a good deal in various localities; yet there was for a long time nothing of fixity or exclusiveness about these, as if they or any one of them were the only allowable or valid medium of full fellowship with the heavenly Father and "the brethren" in Christ, the supreme bond whether between God and men or between man and man.

Accordingly, Sunday worship was only part—doubtless the most precious and sacred part—of a chain of social worship running through all the days of the week and keeping the Christian in realized fellowship with various groups of his brethren, sometimes smaller and sometimes larger, even when it was not possible to meet with them all as a single body, the local form of the one church of God. There were, for instance, domestic¹¹ eucharists at which only a single household (with perhaps one or two guests) was represented, as well as the "house-churches" referred to in Paul's epistles,¹² where a prominent Christian threw open his¹³ house as a regular rendezvous for the brethren in the immediate neighborhood, and that for all "church" purposes. Indeed, remembering the exigencies of the space needed, especially for reclining at the Lord's Supper, we are forced to conclude that Christian common worship for the most part took this decentralized form in every large city, once numbers increased beyond a point that would soon be reached. We must

¹¹ As within the primitive Jerusalem community, in Acts 2:46; compare the informal "breaking of bread" which occurs again and again in the Clementines.

¹² E. g., Rom., chap. 16.

¹³ E. g., the mother of John Mark, Acts 12:12.

recollect that the pictures of meetings of the whole Christian body in Corinth refer to a very early stage in that church's history.

This leads us to remark that we gather from 1 Cor., chap. 14, read along with 11:17 f., that there were two distinct kinds of church meeting (*ἐκκλησία*)—one for general mutual edification,¹⁴ the other for partaking of the Lord's Supper;¹⁵ and that each had elements common to both and elements peculiar to itself. This is a matter of extreme importance, since the service described by Justin Martyr about the middle of the second century represents a fusion of these into one, leading to certain changes which tend to obscure the original meaning of parts of the worship there described, and from which our notions of primitive Christian worship are generally derived. Naturally the two kinds of meeting, when they occurred on the same day—as they soon came to do on the Lord's Day, if they did not do so from the first—must have had special seasons set apart for them, probably with as long an interval as possible in between. For one thing, the Christians pursued their ordinary avocations, like their neighbors, on the Lord's Day; and so it would be natural to meet once before the work of the day began, and when their gathering would cause least comment, and once after the day's work was done, at the hour of the evening meal or supper (*δείπνον*). Now this is exactly what we find described by Pliny as the habit of Christians in Bithynia-Pontus, about 112 A. D.

So much for the times of the two chief Christian assemblies. As to their procedure, our chief evidence for the apostolic age is afforded by Pauline epistles.

1. As regards the meeting for mutual edification, we gather from 1 Cor., chaps. 12–14, supplemented by 1 Thess. 5:11 ff.; Rom. 12:3 ff. (cf. 1 Pet. 4:10 f.); Eph. 4:7–13, that perfect freedom of utterance obtained in the assembly, where each was bound to contribute (*κοινωνεῖν*), according to his *charisma*, to the common spiritual stock, just as he was bound to contribute of his material goods—also as impelled by the *charisma* of Christian liberality.¹⁶ “When ye come together, each one hath a psalm, hath a teaching, hath a revelation, hath a ‘tongue,’ hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying. . . . For ye all can prophesy one by one, that all

¹⁴ 1 Cor., chap. 14; especially vss. 4, 26. ¹⁵ 11:20. ¹⁶ Rom. 12:6, 8.

may learn, and all may be exhorted.”¹⁷ In fact, the whole ministry of the assembly as it “built itself up in love” was *charismatic* in basis, and the one guarantee for genuine and orderly exercise of the “gifts” of the many “members” in the service of the one “body,” was the Spirit, possessing this body as a whole and leading it to “discern spirits” and recognize when any was or was not speaking “unto edification.” The function of guiding or controlling the conduct of the assembly’s worship was not yet, at the stage implied in 1 Corinthians, delegated to any presiding brethren or officers elected by the Spirit-bearing church, though in 1 Cor. 16:15-18, as in 1 Thess. 5:12 f., there is the germ of a special volunteer ministry of a sort which developed quite naturally into an ordinary presidency, without superseding the final jurisdiction of the brethren collectively, whose “sense” they would strive to take and express in their decisions. Yet throughout the whole of the first century the free “prophetic” character of participation in common worship was recognized, whatever the practical limitations which gradually emerged out of *the accumulated prophetic precedents and experience* of each Spirit-led local assembly, and the similar experience of its neighbors.

One outcome of this process of specialization in the ministry of the assembly’s self-edification was that, apart from the appointed leaders, only men of marked prophetic gift, such as constituted a “prophet” by general consent,¹⁸ ventured, as a rule, to contribute a “word of teaching,” or to voice the prayer and praise of the church from their own inner, inspired resources. This is the stage represented by the *Didachê*, 80-100 A. D., for Alexandria and Egypt in particular. But already about 95 A. D. the epistle of Clement seems to imply serious trouble in the church of Corinth on the very point whether “prophets” should be allowed, as formerly, to offer the church’s solemn prayer of thanksgiving (eucharist) over its “gifts” or thank-offerings from God’s own earthly bounty, presented to the Sovereign Father in the name of his beloved son, the high priest, who, as pictured, for instance, in the Apocalypse, was conceived as presenting the spiritual counterpart, “the prayers of the saints,” at the heavenly altar. As a rule, however, the most prophetic men (the “prophets and teachers” of the *Didachê*) seem to have passed gradually into the

¹⁷ 1 Cor. 14:26, 31.

¹⁸ Cf. 1 Cor. 12:28 f.

ranks of the official elders or bishops, the higher order of the regular ministry in each church, as in the case of Ignatius of Antioch and Polycarp of Smyrna; and so, for this among other reasons, the distinct order of "prophets" began to fade away about the beginning of the second century, though not equally rapidly everywhere. To this advance of the official ministry, constituted by formal appointment of each local church, corresponded the growth of fixed forms of worship, especially in prayer. The earliest extant specimens of these are the eucharistic prayers of the *Didaché*, and the long, stately prayer at the end of 1 Clement, in which we may see the type then prevailing in the Roman church, whether in its general meeting for worship or at the special eucharistic meeting. To this latter we must now revert.

2. From Paul's references to the evening meeting of the church "to eat (the) Lord's Supper," we gather that at first it was simply a common meal of fellowship hallowed by prayer and religious associations, with which both Jews and gentiles were familiar under somewhat differing conditions. Perhaps the nearest analogy is afforded by the sacred meals of the Essenes in Palestine and the Therapeutæ in the neighborhood of Alexandria, both developments of Judaism prior to the Christian church. In Philo's account of the latter we gather that hymns entered largely into the sacredness of the occasion. Paul says nothing of this in 1 Cor., chap. 11, but in Eph. 5:18-21 we read: "Be not drunken with wine, wherein is riot, but be filled in spirit, speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord, giving thanks ('making eucharist') always for all things in the name of our Lord Jesus to God, even the Father, subjecting yourselves one to another in the fear of Christ." Here, and in the parallel passage in Col. 3:13-17, which adds several significant touches (as to "mutual forgiveness," "love, which is the bond of perfectness," and "the peace of Christ" "arbitrating" in hearts, as befits those "called in one body"), one must surely recognize some specific reference to the festive gladness and exuberant good-fellowship of the Lord's Supper,¹⁹ which was liable to excess when men drank deep of wine rather than of the Spirit,²⁰ the true source of the one

¹⁹ Cf. below, p. 351, for Tertullian's account of singing as a feature of the *Agapé* in his own day.

heart and soul²¹ which such table-fellowship tended to promote, as we see already in Acts 2:46. What Paul sets before us, therefore, as existing in his churches is a feast of brotherly love, after the model of the Last Supper itself, and in the course of which some commemorative reference, probably in a special prayer or prayers of blessing²² or thanksgiving,²³ was made to the redeeming death of Messiah, their Lord. And with this agree not only the love-feasts (*agapæ*) of Jude, vs. 12; 2 Pet. 2:13, but all the references in the literature of the sub-apostolic age, down to Ignatius²⁴ and Pliny early in the second century. The most notable of these are those in *Didaché*, ix, x, with its reference to "being filled" (between the prayers before and after partaking), and to the exemption of "prophets" from adhering to the traditional forms of eucharistic prayer there quoted. A striking feature of these is their affinity in idea and phrase with the Jewish prayers at certain sacred meals, particularly the *Kiddūsh* or "sanctification" prayer prior to the paschal meal, such as Jesus himself may have used before instituting his holy memorial "breaking of bread" and handing around of wine.

With all these things before us, we approach the last and most explicit piece of evidence for the sub-apostolic age proper, the famous letter of Pliny, reporting to the emperor Trajan the features most distinctive of Christian Sunday worship. These are (1) a meeting before dawn, including (a) "a hymn²⁵ (*carmen*) to Christ as to a God," sung responsively, (b) a pledging of themselves in solemn form (*sacramento*) against theft, adultery, and other prevalent forms of social wrong; and (2) a meeting later in the day "for taking food, yet ordinary and innocent food." Such are the points which stood out in Pliny's mind as worthy of special note, doubtless from among such other details of both meetings as he cared to elicit from the

²⁰ 1 Cor. 11:21, with Eph. 5:18.

²² Cf. 1 Cor. 10:16.

²¹ See 1 Cor. 12:13.

²³ Cf. *Did.*, ix, x.

²⁴ See Lightfoot's note on Ignat., *Ad Smyrn.*, viii.

²⁵ Some idea of its form may be got from 1 Tim. 3:16 and Eph. 5:14, which are perhaps snatches from such primitive hymns in Christ's honor. 2 Tim. 2:12 f. also may afford a specimen of the line of thought likely to be taken, especially in view of the notion of Christians pledging themselves to fealty to Christ's will which next emerges in Pliny's report.

ex-Christians whom he interrogated. Among such more ordinary features of religious worship we may with confidence supply, for the early meeting, prayer; reading from the Old Testament Scriptures; instruction based on them, especially by way of moral exhortation, such as would naturally be followed by the pledging afresh to the contents of their baptismal vow,²⁶ to which Pliny alludes as bearing on the slanders spread against Christians—slanders which also occasion his description of the Christian social food as of an ordinary kind. The main question that remains is in regard to the order in which the items may have come. The analogy of the synagogue favors (a) singing—psalm, hymn, or sacred song;²⁷ (b) prayer; (c) Scripture lessons; (d) address;²⁸ (e) vow of rededication; (f) benediction.

As regards the later meeting, if we may judge by Tertullian's account of the Christian *Agapē* in North Africa at the close of the second century (already separated from the eucharist proper), we may imagine it thus: (a) prayer (no doubt of thanksgiving for God's good gifts for body and soul, on lines of *Didachē*, ix, x); (b) the meal, mingled with conversation; (c) washing of hands and bringing in of lights; (d) singing by individuals,²⁹ from Scripture (e. g., psalms), or hymns of one's own composition; (e) prayer.

Finally we pass beyond the age of primitive Christianity proper, to that represented by Justin Martyr, who, writing soon after 150 A. D., gives us the most exact account of Christian worship which we possess for the period before the alliance of church and state in the fourth century. Here we have no longer two meetings of the church on Sunday, but only one, in the morning, embracing the leading features of both of those known to Pliny. Yet the fusion

²⁶ Cf. *Did.*, vii, 1, for acceptance of the substance of the "Two Ways" as rule of life, presupposed by baptism, in Egypt at least.

²⁷ Hippolytus, in Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, v, 28, refers to "*psalms and songs* (*ψᾶλμοὶ καὶ ᾠδαὶ*) of the brethren from the beginning written by believers, such as hymn (*ὑμνοῦντες*) Christ as the Word of God." Compare the "Morning Hymn" in the Codex Alexandrinus, which has a section addressed to Christ, and the Alexandrine Clement's hymn of grateful praise to the Christ the Word, as the *Pædagogus*, or guardian of souls.

²⁸ Stanley, *Christian Institutions*, p. 56, well points out that "homily," the early term for instruction from the Word in public service, had the least formal of associations, as it meant "a conversation" (as did *sermo*, a sermon); "not a speech or set discourse, but a talk, a homely colloquial instruction."

²⁹ See the words quoted above, p. 349, from Eph. 5:18 f.; cf. Col. 3:16.

meant great change both in the form and in the idea of the Lord's Supper, hitherto observed as an evening meal, in an apartment fitted with couches for reclining in ancient fashion. This very circumstance helps to explain how, quite naturally—apart from abuses real or imagined by hostile neighbors—the original form of the social feast became unmanageable by simple reason of increasing numbers, conjoined with the desire to meet all together³⁰ as a local church, wherever this was in any way feasible. But there was grave danger of discontinuity, of losing something of the essential spirit of the older and religiously simpler practice, when the eucharist—as it came to be called, to the disuse of original titles—was detached from its native context in a real, brotherly meal with sacred accompaniments and associations, and placed at the end of the meeting for religious worship and instruction. The change was the more serious that this meeting was itself already modified in nature, by the dying out of the element of active mutual edification, and had become more ritually formal and official in conduct. Accordingly, when the *quondam* love-meal, based on the remembrance of the sacrifice of the church's Lord, survived simply in the form of bread and wine, of which the communicants received comparatively small portions as symbolic tokens of food, rather than as food itself, we can hardly wonder if the impression on the worshiper (as the participant now felt himself to be, and nothing more) was a different one from what it had been. New associations began to gather around the transformed eucharist, and that from quarters very different from the original or evangelic ones. It had become simply a religious rite, and it suggested classification with certain of the many pagan rites whereby communion with the Deity, rather than with one's fellows, was vouchsafed to the worshiper. Justin seems to have some inkling of the new danger thus presented; for in expounding his view of the bread and wine as sacramental in consequence of the formula of prayer uttered over them in commemoration of Christ's words of institution, he

³⁰ It was the desire to express outwardly the spiritual unity of the church, and to avoid easy occasions for fostering a "hole and corner" spirit of sectarianism or aberrant doctrinal tendencies, such as the older gatherings of house-churches presented, which caused Ignatius to insist on the presence of the bishop (i. e., chief local pastor), or of one of his co-presbyters at his request, at every gathering which claimed the character of a meeting of the church.

says: "Which very thing in the mysteries of Mithra also the wicked demons have handed over to take place, by way of imitation; for that bread and a cup of water are set forth, with certain explanatory words, in the rites by which one is fully initiated, you either have gathered or can learn."

But, waiving further comment on the changed conception of the eucharist itself which its transformation and new position may at once have indicated and fostered, we will sum up the order of Christian worship as practiced in many churches known to a man like Justin; for he cannot do more than give what he felt to be a typical account of it, and not one strictly true of all parts of the church in his day:

1. [Opening prayer.]³¹

. Lessons from the gospels *or* the prophets (=the Old Testament), as long as time permits; read by one simply described as "he who reads" (*ὁ ἀναγιγνώσκων*), possibly with explanatory comments.

3. The hortatory address of the presiding officer (*ὁ προεστώς*, the bishop or his delegate), based on the lessons or some part of them.

4. All rise and so offer prayers³² (*εὐχὰς πέμπομεν*), for themselves and all others everywhere, in earnest tones (*εὐτόνως*).

5. Mutual salutation with a kiss³³ (= "kiss of peace").

6. Bread and a cup of wine and water, already mixed (by the deacons), brought to the presiding officer.

7. These he takes in his hands and sends up prayers (like those of the people, *ὁμοίως*) and thanksgivings, to the best of his ability (*ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ*), to the Father of the universe through the name of the Son and the Holy Spirit, with special thanksgiving "for being deemed worthy of these favors from his hand" (*τούτων παρ' αὐτοῦ*).

8. The people emphatically associates itself in this act, with the "Amen."

³¹ The opening prayer and the final benediction are omitted by Justin, probably as taken for granted. Both were features of the Jewish synagogal worship and are found in later Christian documents.

³² Cf. 1 Tim. 2:1-4, 8.

³³ This probably came towards the end of the original first or morning service, just before the benediction. It formed, however, a fitting transition to the second part of the combined service, since brotherly love or peace was specially insisted on in connection with the eucharist (originally the love-meal); cf. *Did.*, xiv, 1, in particular.

9. The deacons hand around, and the people take, each his portion; and the participation extends to those not present, the deacons conveying their share to such.

10. [Benediction.]³¹

As regards the position of the whole church's prayers, it may be suggested that they were removed from their original and natural place at the beginning (as in the synagogue), in order to be brought into close association with the eucharistic prayer (now added through the fusion of the two orders of service), which was felt to be the center of the service, and to which the other prayers are now made to lead up. But, in any case, it is clear that the key to public worship in Justin's day, and henceforth, is a perception that it represents the fusion of two services originally distinct both in time and in associations. It must not be thought, however, that the service of the ancient church reached its definitive structural form even in Justin. We find that the liturgies of the fourth century, in spite of great affinities, differ a good deal; and we must assume that in certain typical centers these differences go back to Justin's time, or even farther. But, as has been said, Justin's is a fairly representative order of service; and though we cannot call it strictly primitive, yet it is of high interest as showing the intermediate stage between the primitive and the non-primitive or "catholic" type of Christian worship.